

GOODMAN, SIDNEY J.  
PAGE 1 OF 1

170 Villanova Drive  
Paramus, NJ 07652  
July 31, 1998

Executive Director  
U.S. Department of Energy  
Washington, DC

Dear Director:

I am vehemently opposed to the use of MOX fuel in civilian nuclear power plants.

There are already serious problems of unaccounted for sensitive materials without putting weapons grade plutonium in mass circulation.

Every step in the direction of putting us on a plutonium economy risks unconscionable environmental, economic, and weapons proliferation problems.

The nuclear industry has failed miserably in its responsibility to the general welfare.

The last thing we need now is another arrogant, corrupt blunder.

Very truly yours,

*Sidney J. Goodman, P.E.*  
Sidney J. Goodman, P.E.  
Professional Engineer

FD173

#### FD173-1

#### MOX Approach

DOE acknowledges the commentator's opposition to the commercial use of weapons-usable plutonium. The proposed use of MOX fuel is consistent with the nonproliferation policy and would ensure that plutonium which was produced for nuclear weapons and subsequently declared excess to national security needs is never again used for nuclear weapons. Consistent with the U.S. policy of discouraging the civilian use of plutonium, a MOX facility would be built and operated subject to the following strict conditions: construction would take place at a secure DOE site, it would be owned by the U.S. Government, operations would be limited exclusively to the disposition of surplus plutonium, and the MOX facility would be shut down at the completion of the surplus plutonium disposition program. For reactor irradiation, the NRC license would authorize only the participating reactors to use MOX fuel fabricated from surplus plutonium, and the irradiation would be a once-through cycle with no reprocessing.

**NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION**  
**LAWRENCE SCHMIDT**  
**PAGE 1 OF 1**



**State of New Jersey**

Christine Todd Whitman  
Governor

Department of Environmental Protection

Robert C. Shinn, Jr.  
Commissioner

Office of Program Coordination  
PO Box 418  
Trenton, NJ 08625-0418  
Phone 609-292-2662  
Fax 609-777-0942

August 25, 1998

Mr. G. Bert Stevenson  
NEPA Compliance Officer  
Office of Fissile Materials Disposition  
U.S. Department of Energy  
P.O. Box 23786  
Washington, D.C. 20026-3786

RE: **COMMENTS**  
Surplus Plutonium Disposition Draft EIS  
DOE/EIS-0283-D

Dear Mr. Stevenson:

The Office of Program Coordination of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) has completed its review of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Surplus Plutonium Disposition. None of the three proposed sites are in the Northeast, consequently our Department's Radiation Protection Programs foresees no environmental impact to New Jersey, at this time, from the siting, construction or operation of any of the facilities. In addition, they foresee no increase in transportation of radioactive materials in New Jersey as result of this action.

However, one alternative facility would produce Mixed Oxide Fuel (MOX). This fuel would be manufactured as fuel for a commercial nuclear power plant. As stated in the Draft EIS, specific reactor sites where this fuel will be used have not been identified. The Final EIS will include an environmental impact analysis related to specific reactors selected. Thus, there is no indication, at this time, if any nuclear power plants in New Jersey will utilize MOX fuel.

Please send the Office of Program Coordination two copies of the Final EIS, when it becomes available, so that we can review potential environmental impacts associated with the use of MOX fuel in New Jersey.

Sincerely,  
  
Lawrence Schmidt  
Director  
Office of Program Coordination

C: Jill Lipoti, NJDEP

New Jersey is an Equal Opportunity Employer  
Recycled Paper

MD115

**MD115-1**

**Alternatives**

DOE acknowledges the commentor's conclusions that the surplus plutonium disposition program would not impact the State of New Jersey.

**MD115-2**

**MOX Approach**

Section 4.28 was revised to discuss the potential environmental impacts of using MOX fuel in the six reactors proposed for the MOX approach. None of the proposed reactors are in New Jersey, they are: Catawba Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2 in South Carolina, McGuire Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2 in North Carolina, and North Anna Power Station Units 1 and 2 in Virginia.